



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,030	10/26/2001	Hong-Goo Kang	2000-0588	5014
75	90 07/07/2005		EXAM	INER
Samuel H. Dworetsky AT&T Corp.			RIVERO, MINERVA	
P.O. Box 4110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110			2655	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Autieus Commune	10/002,030	KANG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Minerva Rivero	2655				
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/1	<u>0/05</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th	This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	·.					
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• ,	'				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
. Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application (F 10-102)				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Responding to the Office Action mailed 9/09/2005, in the Remarks filed on 1/10/2005, Applicant amended the specification submitted 10/26/2001 to correct language errors. Furthermore, Applicant amended claims 2-3 and 16-17, and submitted arguments to traverse the rejection of claims 1-22.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1 and 12, Applicant argues that Westerlund *et al.* perform the disclosed method in an encoder and not in a decoder (p. 9). Furthermore, Applicant argues that an original voice input signal does not comprise a reference signal based on a received communication.

The Examiner cannot concur with the Applicant. Westerlund et al. disclose adjusting the operational parameters of a decoder (Col. 2, Lines 26-30). In the method disclosed by Westerlund et al. a decoder is included in the encoding side as required by

the analysis-by-synthesis procedure. The input speech, which is a received communication segmented into frames, serves as a reference signal for the analysis-bysynthesis procedure performed within the method disclosed by Westerlund et al.. The analysis-by-synthesis procedure, as well known in the art, involves the comparison of a reference signal to an iteratively produced signal with the objective of minimizing the difference between the two, resulting in the finding of a combination of parameters that produces the signal that minimizes the aforementioned difference. Therefore the claims stay rejected.

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Westerlund et al. (U.S. 6,757,654).
- Regarding claims 1 and 12, Westerlund et al. disclose a method/apparatus for 5.

Application/Control Number: 10/002,030

Art Unit: 2655

mitigating errors in frames of a received communication, comprising (1) determining a reference signal based on the received communication (Col 1, Lines 58-60), (2) determining a modified reference signal based on the received communication (Col 2, Lines 11-14) and (3) adjusting an adaptive codebook gain based on a difference between the reference signal and the modified reference signal (Col 2, Lines 15-30; Col 4, Line 66 – Col 5, Line 26).

Page 4

- 6. Regarding claims 2 and 13, Westerlund *et al.* disclose the method/apparatus wherein the reference signal is determined based on transmitting parameters of the received communication (Col 2, Lines 31-44; Col 4, Lines 25-32).
- 7. Regarding claims 3 and 14, Westerlund *et al.* disclose the method/apparatus wherein the transmitting parameters include at least a long-term prediction lag, fixed codebook, adaptive codebook gain vector g_p, fixed codebook gain vector g_c and linear prediction coefficients A(z) (Col 2, Lines 56-62; Col 3, Lines 24-33; Col 13, Line 58-Col 14, Line 7).
- 8. Regarding claims 4, 6, 15 and 17, Westerlund *et al.* disclose the method/apparatus wherein the reference signal is determined by adding an adaptive codebook vector with a fixed codebook vector to form an excitation signal and passing the excitation signal through a synthesis filter (Col 2, Lines 50-62; Col 19, Lines 27-29).

Application/Control Number: 10/002,030 Page 5

Art Unit: 2655

9. Regarding claims 7 and 18, Westerlund *et al.* disclose the method/apparatus wherein the adaptive codebook vector is based on at least the long-term prediction lag and the fixed codebook vector is based on the fixed codebook (Col 1, Lines 39-57; Col 3, Lines 14-33; Col18, Lines 11-43).

- 10. Regarding claims 5, 8, 16 and 19, Westerlund *et al.* disclose the method/apparatus wherein the adaptive codebook vector is amplified by an adaptive codebook gain vector g_p and the fixed codebook vector is amplified by a fixed codebook gain vector g_c prior to being added together to form the excitation signal (Col 4, Lines 25-32; Col 4, Line 66-Col 5, Line 26).
- 11. Regarding claims 9 and 20, Westerlund *et al.* disclose the method/apparatus wherein the difference between the reference signal and the modified reference signal is based on a mean squared error between the reference signal and the modified reference signal (Col 2, Lines 15-24; Col 4, Lines 13-15).
- 12. Regarding claims 10 and 21, Westerlund *et al.* disclose the method/apparatus wherein the difference between the reference signal and the modified signal is based on the mean squared error between the reference signal and the modifying reference signal, wherein the difference is minimized (Col 2, Lines 15-30; Col 4, Lines 13-15; Fig.3, element 316).

Art Unit: 2655

13. Regarding claims 11 and 22, Westerlund *et al.* disclose the method/apparatus wherein the difference between the reference signal and the modified reference signal is minimized according to the equation: $\min_{g'p,g'c} (N_s-1)\Sigma (n=0) (h(n)^*(u(n) - (g'_pv'(n) + g'_cc'(n))))^2$ where N_s is a subframe size and h(n) is an impulse response corresponding to 1/A(z) (Col 2, Lines 15-30; Col 4, Lines 3-15).

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Scott *et al.* (US 5,642,465) disclose a speech coding method of obtaining quantization values of a synthesis filter based on the spectral state of the speech signal in order to attain an appropriate energy distribution.

Chu et al. (Subband ADPCM coding for wideband audio signals using analysis-by-synthesis quantization scheme, Proceedings ISSIPNN, April 1994) disclose an analysis-by-synthesis quantization scheme.

Wang et al. (A voicing-driven packet loss recovery algorithm for analysis-by-synthesis predictive speech coders over Internet, IEEE Transactions on Multimedia, March 2001) disclose a packet loss recovery algorithm.

Noll et al. (Reconstruction of missing speech frames using sub-band excitation, Proceedings of the IEEE-SP, June 1996) disclose reconstruction of missing frames which involves analyzing the speech signal immediately preceding the missing frame and retaining important speech parameters while generating the substitute signal.

De Martin *et al.* (Improved frame erasure concealment for CELP-based coders, ICASSP Proceedings, June 2000) disclose a frame erasure concealment algorithm fro CELP coders.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minerva Rivero whose telephone number is (571) 272-7626. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis Ivars Smits can be reached on (571) 272-7628. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MR 6/29/05

TALIVALDIS IVARS SMITS PRIMARY EXAMINER